

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated August 31, 2009 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 13-14, 16-18 and 20 are hereby amended; claims 15 and 19 are hereby canceled; and claims 21-23 are hereby added. Accordingly, claims 13-14, 16-18, and 20-23 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

In the present office action, 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants respectfully disagree with these rejections. This rejection with respect to claims 15 and 19 is rendered moot with the cancellation of these claims without prejudice, disclaimer or admission. In rejecting claims 16 and 17, the Office Action states that “the specification is not enabling for edge contours that are ‘pressed below the interior region.’” In rejecting claims 14 and 18, the Office Action states “the specification does not teach, suggest or disclose an edge contour that has a substantially linear shape . . .” Applicants respectfully disagree and refer the examiner without limitation to at least page 2, lines 1-8 , page 3, lines 21-28, and page 4, lines 21-27 of the originally filed specification.

The drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) with respect to the feature “the edge contour with substantially continuous curve.” This objection is moot in light of amendments made hereby.

Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,146,252 to Martensson in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,858,160 to Piacente. Independent claim 13 recites “the product having both a perimeter area having an edge contour and an interior region, wherein the perimeter area is relieved such that a portion of the edge contour is below the interior region, wherein the interior region has a surface texture that varies in accordance with a visual pattern printed on the at least one cellulose sheet.” None of the art of record, including Martensson and Piacente teach or suggest this combination of limitations.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 13 and claims 14 and 16, which depend from claim 13, are allowable over the cited references.

Furthermore, new claims 21-23 are allowable at least in that each of these claims recites a combination of features not taught or suggested by the cited prior art.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: February 26, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By /Rebecca G. Rudich/
Rebecca G. Rudich
Registration No.: 41,786
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant